GREENBELT COMMISSION MINUTES OF January 23, 2012

The Greenbelt Commission of the City of Norman, Cleveland County, State of Oklahoma, met for the Regular Meeting on January 23, 2012, at 6:30 p.m. Notice and Agenda of the meeting were posted at 201 W Gray Building A, the Norman Municipal Building and at www.normanok.gov twenty-four hours prior to the beginning of the meeting.

ITEM NO. 1 BEING: CALL TO ORDER.

Chairperson Jane Ingels called the meeting to order at 6:31 p.m.

 \approx \approx \approx \approx

ITEM NO. 2 BEING: ROLL CALL.

MEMBERS PRESENT:

Bob Bruce

Jack Eure Jane Ingels

Mark Krittenbrink Jim McCampbell Richard McKown

Mary Peters Sarah Smith

MEMBERS ABSENT:

Geoff Canty

STAFF MEMBERS PRESENT:

Susan Connors, Director of Planning & Community

Development

Ken Danner, Subdivision Development Manager, Public

Works

Jane Hudson, Planner II

Jolana McCart, Admin Tech IV

GUESTS PRESENT:

Mike Milligan Cindy Milligan Travis Spears

 \approx \approx \approx \approx

Greenbelt Commission Minutes January 23, 2012 Page 2 of 5

ITEM NO. 3 BEING: Election of Officers for 2012.

Nomination for Chair: M Peters nominated J Ingels for Chair; **Second** by B Bruce. All approve.

Nomination for Vice-Chair: J Eure nominated B Bruce for Vice-Chair; **Second** by J McCampbell. The nomination was refused due to other commitments.

Nomination for Vice-Chair: J Ingels nominated J Eure for Vice-Chair; **Second** by M Krittenbrink. All approve.

New members of the Commission, Sarah Smith and Mark Krittenbrink, were introduced.

 \approx \approx \approx \approx

ITEM NO. 4 BEING: Approval of the Minutes from the December 19, 2011 Regular Meeting.

Motion by M Peters for approval; **Second** by B Bruce. All approve.

 \approx \approx \approx \approx

Chair Ingels and S Connors explained to the new members the difference between Consent and Non-Consent agenda items. The Consent Docket consists of items which staff has determined present no greenbelt opportunities; the Non-Consent Docket items are presented to the Commission for greenbelt opportunity discussion.

During the discussion of Item 5, b, Chair Ingels requested that in the future the Staff Reports include any indication of a Water Quality Protection Zone on the property being addressed in an application.

ITEM NO. 5 BEING: Review of Greenbelt Enhancement Statement Applications.

a. CONSENT DOCKET

i. GBC 12-01

Applicant: Mike & Cindy Milligan

Location: Generally located on the north side of Rock Creek Road

approximately 132 feet west of 12th Avenue NW

Request: Preliminary Plat of 2.4 acres for Milligan Trucking Addition

This site is for a trucking business, with trucks accessing the area, making general pedestrian traffic impractical.

Motion by M Krittenbrink for approval of the Consent Docket; **Second** by R McKown. All approve.

b. NON-CONSENT DOCKET

ii. GBC 12-02

Applicant: Travis K. Spears

Location: Generally located on the west side of 84th Avenue NE

approximately 1/4 mile south of Indian Hills Road

Request: Norman Rural Certificate of Survey Plat for Travis Acres

J Hudson gave the staff report. The applicant is requesting that this approximately 40 acre parcel to be divided into four single-family lots, three 10-acre parcels and one 9.94-acre parcel. The owner has indicated that it is his full intention to keep the property as open and undisturbed as possible.

Chair Ingels referred to the Guidelines for Evaluating Greenbelt Enhancement Statements to evaluate the criteria to make their recommendation. The Greenbelt Commission found that the following Guidelines were relevant to this request:

Sec. 4-2028. Guidelines for Evaluating Greenbelt Enhancement Statements.

- (c) Existing easements (e.g. utility, pipeline, oil lease right of way, etc) may be used for Greenway where appropriate and where expressly approved by the easement grantor and grantee.
- (f) Adverse impacts on existing topography, drainage patterns and natural vegetation are minimized. (The Commission is in agreement with the stated goal of the applicant to preserve the natural/existing vegetation and wildlife of the property.)
- (j) Permeable ground surfaces have been preserved to the extent possible. (Zoning)
- (r) To the extent possible, the development layout, as designed, does not impair the ability of riparian buffers from serving as corridors for wildlife movement.

Motion by J Eure to send the application forward with comments; **Second** by M Krittenbrink. All approve.

 Greenbelt Commission comments and suggestions from the January 23rd meeting regarding proposed developments submitted for Planning Commission and City Council consideration are as follows:

(See attached comments written following the meeting and submitted with the recommendation to the Planning Commission and City Council.)



ITEM NO. 6 BEING: Miscellaneous Discussion.

S Connors stated that the final draft of the Greenways Master Plan would be ready by the February 20th regular meeting. A Public Meeting to hear public comments about the Plan will be held in conjunction with this meeting. Chair Ingels asked what plans were being made for advertising. S Connors said that announcements on Channel 20, the City website, in water bill mail outs, posting at the library, on NPR, at Planning Commission and City Council meeting and a press release have been considered.

J Eure asked if it was appropriate for the Commission to ask the applicant for plans for the streetscape, such as fencing, plantings, etc. or just go with the bare minimum City requirements or is the Commission viewing the street as part of the Greenbelt System. S Connors said that neither the Greenways Plan nor the Greenbelt Ordinance creates additional streetscaping requirements. The question can be asked of the applicant, and suggestions can be given, but the Commission does not have the authority to ask the applicant to do more than what the City requires.

Chair Ingels said that she had been thinking of where the Commission should go from here now that the Greenways Master Plan would soon be complete. She said that she had spent some time reviewing the established duties of the Commission as stated in the Greenbelt Commission Ordinance. One task was to identify funding sources for acquisitions and another was to make recommendations to the City Council regarding other policies related to Greenbelt issues.

She added that it is important to make sure that the citizens of Norman were supportive of the Greenbelt/Trail Plan and are willing to pay for it. She felt that a PR volunteer who is willing to look at other communities and what can be done to get people excited about the program would be beneficial, along with discussion of what kind of action would be needed to gain public support to fund the acquisition and development of the trail system. R McKown said that what he had seen done in other communities was to present a major demonstration project to build public understanding of what a trailsystem can be. Lake Hefner is used as an example for Oklahoma City.

Chair Ingels asked for an ad hoc committee to come up with some vision ideas for the Commission. J Eure volunteered.



ITEM NO. 7 BEING: Adjournment.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:50 p.m.